



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1650  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,208	07/14/2003	Baskaran Dharmarajan	MS1-1563US	6382
22801	7590	04/24/2007	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			BAROT, BHARAT	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2155		
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS	04/24/2007		ELECTRONIC	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 04/24/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhptoms@leehayes.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/619,208	DHARMARAJAN, BASKARAN	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Bharat N. Barot	2155	

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —  
**Period for Reply:**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### **Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2003.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### **Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### **Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date 07/14/2003.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-30 presented for examination.

**Specification**

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-21 and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 26 recite the limitations "receiving..., loading..., identifying..., caching..., and processing..." are unclear about the locations and also missing source and destination of steps claimed in the claims 1 and 26.

Claims 11 and 17 recite the limitations "receiving..., identifying..., determining..., and retrieving..." are unclear about the locations and also missing source and destination of steps claimed in the claims 11 and 17.

Other dependent claims, which are not specifically cited above are also rejected because of the deficiencies of their respective parent claims.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103(a)**

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-10 and 22-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parenteau et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,515,598) in view of Atkin et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,547).

7. As to claims 1-4, Parenteau et al teach a method (see abstract) comprising: receiving a file index (index value) associated with a plurality of localized strings of data; loading the file index into a memory device (tracking table); identifying pointers to frequently used localized strings; caching the identified pointers (storing the pointers in a lookup table); and processing (matching and compressing) requests (figures 3-5; column 4 line 11 to column 5 line 21; column 5 lines 36-64; and column 11 lines 1-24 and 32-34).

However, Parenteau et al do not teach that processing requests for Web content; and each of the plurality of localized strings has an associated language and an associated locale.

Atkin et al teach a method (see abstract) comprising: processing requests for Web content; and each of the plurality of localized strings has an associated language and an associated locale (figure 2; and column 3 line 28 to column 4 line 42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Parenteau et al by incorporating the teaching of Atkin et al as stated above for processing requests for Web content because it would have provided support for a wide array of languages dynamically selected at run time and without the need for modification of the application.

8. As to claims 5-6, Parenteau et al (in combination with Atkin et al) teach that processing requests for Web content includes: identifying at least one localized string associated with a request for Web content; validating the at least one localized string; and using the at least one localized string to process requests for Web content if the at least one localized string is validated (figures 3-5; column 4 line 45 to column 5 line 21; and column 11 lines 8-24).

9. As to claims 7-9, Atkin et al (in combination with Parenteau et al) teach that identifying pointers to frequently used localized strings includes identifying one or more commonly used languages and frequently requested locales; and the method is performed by a Web server (column 2 lines 1-33).

10. As to claim 10, Atkin et al (in combination with Parenteau et al) disclose that one or more computer-readable memories containing a computer program that is executable by a processor to perform the method recited in claim 1 (figure 1; column 3 lines 7-57; and column 5 lines 51-65).

11. As to claims 22-25, they are also rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claims 1-7 above, since claims 22-25 are merely an apparatus for the method of operations defined in the claims 1-7.

12. As to claims 26-30, they are also rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claims 1-7 above, since claims 26-30 are merely a computer program product comprising computer instructions for the method of operations defined in the claims 1-7.

13. Claims 11-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atkin et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,547) in view of Parenteau et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,515,598).

14. As to claim 11, Atkin et al teach a method (see abstract) comprising: receiving a request for content in a particular language; identifying at least one string associated with the requested content, the at least one string is associated with the particular language; and if the pointer is not stored in the cache, retrieving the at least one string from a storage device (figure 3; and column 4 line 43 to column 5 line 50).

However, Atkin et al do not teach that determining whether a pointer to the at least one string is stored in a cache; if the pointer is stored in the cache: retrieving the pointer from the cache; and retrieving the at least one string using the pointer.

Parenteau et al teach a method (see abstract) comprising: determining whether a pointer to the at least one string is stored in a cache (look-up table); if the pointer is stored in the cache: retrieving the pointer from the cache; and retrieving the at least one string using the pointer (figures 3-5; column 4 line 11 to column 5 line 21; column 5 lines 36-64; and column 11 lines 1-24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Atkin et al by incorporating the teaching of Parenteau et al as stated above for retrieving the at least one string using the pointer because it would have increased a retrieving/accessing speed and utilization of a local memory by increased memory space in the local memory.

15. As to claims 12-14, Atkin et al (in combination with Parenteau et al) teach that generating the requested Web content and providing the requested content to a source of the request; and validating the at least one string, wherein the at least one string has an associated locale (figure 3; and column 4 line 43 to column 5 line 40).

16. As to claim 15, Parenteau et al (in combination with Atkin et al) teach that retrieving the at least one string from a storage device includes: identifying a string index associated with the at least one string; and locating the at least one string using the string index (figures 3-5; column 4 line 11 to column 5 line 21; column 5 lines 36-64; and column 11 lines 1-24).

17. As to claim 16, Atkin et al (in combination with Parenteau et al) disclose that one or more computer-readable memories containing a computer program that is executable by a processor to perform the method recited in claim 11 (figure 1; column 3 lines 7-57; and column 5 lines 51-65).

18. As to claims 17-21, they are also rejected for the same reasons set forth to rejecting claims 11-16 above.

**Additional References**

19. The examiner as of general interest cites the following references.

- a. Michel, U.S. Patent No. 7,146,429.
- b. Curtis et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,278,992.
- b. Kaplan et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,613,145.

**Contact Information**

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Bharat Barot** whose Telephone Number is **(571) 272-3979**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM. Most facsimile-transmitted patent application related correspondence is required to be sent to the Central FAX Number **(571) 273-8300**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Saleh Najjar**, can be reached at **(571) 272-4006**.

*Bharat Barot*  
BHARAT BAROT  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Patent Examiner Bharat Barot

Art Unit 2155

April 03, 2007